REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

1. Claims 1-2, 7-10, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris (US Patent 5,630,148) further in view of Kelkar (US Patent 7,194,254).

Response:

Claim 1

In the Office action dated 06/14/2007, Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kelkar's wireless communication device for accessing URLs with Norris' computer system in order to replace Norris' application program 50 and 52 with Kelkar's URLs for comparing a desired URL to the restricted URL list file in order to select performance state. The applicant disagrees.

As shown in Norris Figs. 3a and 3b, Norris' performance state table records performance states only, and the performance states included in Norris' performance state table are not particularly and respectively assigned to specific application programs executed by the processor. That is, each of Norris' performance states is commonly shared among application programs executed by the processor. Additionally, in accordance with Norris' disclosure, a commonly-shared performance state in the performance state table is selected when requested by an application program (col. 6, lines 9-13). Therefore, even though Norris' application programs could be replaced with Kelkar's URLs listed in the restricted URL list file, a modified system of Norris selects one of the commonly-shared performance state included in the performance state table when directly requested by a desired URL. In other words, as the performance states are not particularly dedicated to specific application programs according to Norris' teachings, the applicant points out that the modified system of Norris does not select a performance state according to a comparison result between the desired URL and the restricted URL list file. Thus, **there is no desirability to modify Norris' performance state table to have addresses of web pages (i.e., Kelkar's URLs) included therein for performance state selection**. As comparing a desired URL to the restricted URL list file for selecting a performance state from the performance state table is against teachings of Norris, the applicant respectfully asserts that a combined teaching of Norris and Kelkar neither

discloses a table including addresses of web pages and frequency or voltage settings of the processor for the web pages, nor teaches using the table to select frequency or voltage set to the processor according to an address of a web page. In short, the claimed features "providing a **prediction table** listing predicted **frequency or voltage settings** of the CPU **for a plurality of web pages**" and "if the **address** of the web page is **listed in the prediction table**, **setting the frequency or voltage of the CPU** to the predicted frequency or voltage setting of the CPU **for the web page listed in the prediction table**" are neither taught nor suggested by Norris in view of Kelkar.

In light of above statements, the applicant asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been overcome. Reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 8

Claims 2 and 8 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 7

In col. 5, lines 1-4, Norris discloses adjusting the clock speed of the processor clock. However, Norris is silent on changing the core voltage of the processor. As claim 7 claims the limitation of changing the CPU core voltage **and** frequency, the applicant asserts that this claimed feature is not taught or suggested by Norris in view of Kelkar. Additionally, claim 7 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 9

In light of above statements under Claim 1, the applicant asserts that the claimed features "a storage device storing a **prediction table** listing predicted frequency or voltage settings **for a plurality of web pages**" and "a power manager for setting the frequency or voltage setting of the CPU when accessing a web page, wherein if **the address of the web page** is listed in the **prediction table**, the power manager sets the frequency or voltage of the CPU to the predicted frequency or voltage setting **for the web page listed in the prediction table**" are neither taught nor suggested by Norris in view of

Kelkar. Therefore, claim 9 should be patentable over the cited references. Reconsideration of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 16

Claims 10 and 16 are dependent on claim 9, and should be allowed if claim 9 is found allowable.

Claim 15

Referring to above statement under Claim 7, the applicant asserts that claim 15 is not anticipated by the combined teaching of the cited references. Additionally, claim 15 is dependent on claim 9, and should be allowed if claim 9 is found allowable.

2. Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris (US Patent 5,630,148) in view of Kelkar (US Patent 7,194,254) as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Brown et al. (US Patent 7,149,905).

Response:

Claim 3

Brown discloses that changes in supply voltage to a processor may be accomplished via download of a new voltage selection table (col. 6, lines 29-31). However, upon careful review of Brown's disclosure, the applicant notes that Brown merely states that the voltage selection table can be updated when optimum voltage of the processor is determined, and the optimum voltage can be initially determined based on the optimum voltage setting for a previous version of a similar processor or later determined via testing (col. 6, lines 43-45; col. 7, lines 6-14). The applicant respectfully points out that Brown neither teaches nor suggests **tracking** CPU workload **for a specific application**, and then determining optimum voltage setting **based on the CPU workload during the processing of the specific application**. Furthermore, Brown discloses that each entry in the voltage selection table may be assigned to a different type of processor by setting the voltage selection value (VSV) of each different type of processor to a unique value (col. 6, lines 29-31). Therefore, entries in Brown's voltage selection table are respectively

assigned to different types of the processor, rather than different application programs executed by the same processor. The applicant respectfully points out that Brown fails to teach or suggest **updating the voltage selection table** to reflect the optimum voltage setting **for the specific application**.

In short, the applicant asserts that the claimed limitations, directed to **tracking** the CPU workload **during the processing of the web page**, **calculating an optimal frequency or voltage setting** for the CPU **based on the CPU workload during the processing of the web page**, and **updating the prediction table** to reflect the optimal frequency or voltage setting **for the web page**, are not taught or suggested by the combined teaching of the cited references. Additionally, claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 11

In light of above statements under Claim 3, the applicants asserts that the claimed limitations recited in claim 11 are neither taught nor suggested by combined teaching of Norris, Kelkar, and Brown. Additionally, claim 11 is dependent on claim 9, and should be allowed if claim 9 is found allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

As independent claims 1 and 9 are found patentable over the cited references according to above remarks, the applicant believes that claims 4-6 and 12-14, dependent on claims 1 and 9 respectively, should still remain in the allowable state.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 09/13/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)